15th March 1954]

MR. SPEAKER :—" It all depends on the merits of each case If the hon. Member brings them to my notice in my chamber, I shall consider them."

SRI S. C. C. ANTHONY PILLAY :—" The Hon. the Minister for Labour has shown that he is opposed to and is not in favour of referring disputes to Tribunals for adjudication. Then it is the duty of the Government to encourage the process of conciliation. Therefore, we do not understand why Government are refusing to appoint Courts of Enquiries and Conciliation Boards. Will Government adopt a policy of strengthening the Conciliation Machinery and grant protection to workers by resort to references of disputes at least to Conciliation Boards? Secondly I would ask . . ."

MR. SPEAKER :—" The hon. Member is making a speech. I cannot permit that."

THE HON. DR U. KRISHNA RAO :—" My hon. Friend is very clever. We are dealing with Courts of Enquiry and he speaks of Conciliation Boards. These things—Court of Enquiry and Conciliation Board—are quite independent and different and as such, I will not walk into his trap by giving an answer."

Chinnar Reservoir Scheme for Perambalur taluk, Tiruchirappalli district.

* 171 *Q.*—SRI K. ARANGANATHAN : Will the Hon. the Minister for Public Works be pleased to state with reference to the answer to starred question No. 1151 given on 28th July 1953, the result of the examination of the plans and estimates of the Chinnar Reservoir Scheme in Perambalur taluk, Tiruchirappalli district?

THE HON. RAJA SRI SHANMUGA RAJESWARA SETHUPATHI :—" As the scheme involves the submersion of nearly 1,500 acres of useful land for the irrigation of 3,000 acres only and as definite reliance cannot be placed on the availability of water supply without detriment to supplies for existing irrigation lower down, the scheme has been deferred."

Issue of liquor permits in Malabar and South Kanara.

* 172 *Q.*—SRI T. ANANTA PAI (on behalf of Sri M. S. Mogral) : Will the Hon. the Minister for Prohibition be pleased to state—

(*a*) the total number of permits for liquor issued for the years 1951–52 and 1952–53 in the districts of Malabar and South Kanara; and

(*b*) the basis on which such permits are issued?

THE HON. SRIMATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM :—" (*a*) During the Official years 1951–52 and 1952–53, the total number of liquor permits issued was 190 (15 to Indians and

[15th March 1954

175 to non-Indians) and 161 (23 to Indians and 138 to non-Indians) in the Malabar district and 19 (5 to Indians and 14 to non-Indians) and 27 (6 to Indians and 21 to non-Indians) in the South Kanara district respectively.

"(b) The applicants for liquor permits are classified into two categories, namely :—

(1) Indians and (2) Non-Indians. In the case of Indians, permits are granted only in exceptional cases on production of a medical certificate from a paid Civil Surgeon. The quantity of liquor is fixed on the following basis of monthly income :—

Between Rs. 500—1,000—one unit per month.

Between Rs. 1,000—2,000—two units per month.

Over Rs. 2,000—four units as a special case.

"As regards non-Indians, permits are granted to those who are 21 years and above on production of their passports. The quantity of liquor allowed to them per month is four units, if their monthly income is below Rs. 500 and eight units, if it is Rs. 500 and above."

SRI V. R. KRISHNA AYYAR :—"May I know from the Hon. Minister whether the medical certificate that has to be produced in the case of Indians is only to prove that the liquor is agreeable to their health or that they may collapse without liquor?"

THE HON. SRIMATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM :—"Sir, that depends upon the opinion of the medical officer and not the Minister."

SRI T. ANANTA PAI :—"Sir, is the number of units allowed dependent upon the income of the applicant or the requirements of his health."

THE HON. SRIMATHI JOTHI VENCATACHELLUM :—"It depends on both. Permits are not issued to persons drawing salaries less than Rs. 500 a month, because they cannot afford to waste on liquors."

Appointment of Public Prosecutor in Tiruchirappalli.

* 173 *Q.*—SRI A. GOVINDASWAMY NAYAGAR : Will the Minister for Law be pleased to state—

(*a*) whether there is any rule that the appointment of Public Prosecutors should be made in accordance with the recommendations of the District Magistrates; and

(*b*) if so, whether this was followed in the appointment of the Public Prosecutor, Government Pleader, and Additional Public Prosecutor, Tiruchirappalli, recently?